

Who?

A Makhyani?

Evidence for climate is far greater than for
new winter.

Evidence for new winter much less (though good.)

Thom. Based on computer models.

But if evidence on climate

Scientific evidence on new winter is depress.

Worth ~~nothing~~ nothing - from me.

Drifts off to

The weapons ^{agreed} ~~changed~~ cannot be adapted
within the present globe

25 years ago, we could have changed:

~~to~~ NPU, ... not signed.

If you don't care about 60% drop

fol 1 (1991?) - a civil power is to be prevented.

Expansion of NATO - to keep Russia out of Russia -
prevent Russia - Russian axis.

// Least can, more preserving itself than living a
risk of global destruction.

Real objective of CW was: prevent the SU decision
from affecting the rest of the world.
(Not SU itself).

Now - preventing their even independence is rest
of the world - is even more important

1973-79 - Struggle VN, oil embargo, rest. of oil
assets in M.E. in '70's (ARABCOs...)

The need of the corp. establishment to have a more
thorough global exploitation - i.e. in US (Gulf War has changed
Koch Bros., central of
US politics)

Communist since AC people have been marginalized
to the extent can be perceived to
do.

(rather, expansion of NATO, fitting in ABM Treaty
FU/ES
/
Koch Bros. of Boeing)

[Wf no

allies Russia - can't draw the to know so long
as it is in NATO - also includes European Union
Gulf War & Iraq being in '98: prevent Euro
from replacing dollar as global currency.

1973 — US abandons Bretton Woods, US \$35

W/ don't everyone abandon dollar in 1973?

No alternative; Ft. Knop in Saudi Arabia + Iran —
needed dollars, + more of them, who will finish
come up.

W/ an alternative appeared (in 1990's, plan
for Euros, ECM-1990 Euro Group Mechanism —
if Europe become a political entity — a unit
will begin clearing the US...

to finance deficits
In 70s-80s, US prints money in 90s
big transaction.

An inflation-based economy (Japan)
dollar bonds — can't sustain imports

of '80's US incurs a huge balance of credit
deficits — people hold debt, put money in US banks

US de-industrialized, TN begin to industrialize
Margin between cost of production & price of sales
increases (Huge expenses for advertising — here — Model for

Euro must be allowed to be alternative.

Prevent oil price dominated in Euros.

Prevent key OPEC countries from negotiating to Euros.

AMaskh

2-2-15

at end of 80's, US doesn't have a physical military presence in '80's

- physical control of oil (to be a ~~key~~ factor
member of OP

Physical occupation of Kuwait; in Saudi
Arabia (until OBL); in Iraq (not from)

to keep it from Antahing to Euro.

As SH was talking - and then. (Khondafu?)

(US helping SH - they want from

AM thinks in ME we asked SH to build pipeline from

not sure

Iraq to Med - go around Persian Gulf

In mid-80's a rift with SH - goal of destroying
from not achieved (Iraqi campaign goal since 1979)
US welcome ✓

Iraq War - 2 axis - occupation (as a factor
- what was it about oil? member of OPEC

to control flow? NO

- Oil corps don't control resources - profits
to states.

Occupation of Kuwait & Iraq - to prevent Euro

(Hostility of Iraqi public too high

Bremer captured - defeated goals
of war in or near - out of control
Kuwait, gone to the Libyans/ Iran

In 2002, had information it from
could have been uncovered
by Libya

Now, Euro is less of a threat

(Vergessen of unity...)

could have helped with a computer-centered Court.
headlines of Euro.

Americans are next as oil-centered is the foreign
policy as before

(since

Wf does US

Post-bound policy: Relinquishing SAC

in US - and R!

(There has been been an age-related safety
or reliability problem

(AM and FOIA require to Los Alamos).

In 1995, Reagan approved a ^{natural} gas pipeline
from R

AP1 - Long Common out - in 2002 private:

on British' demand:

Going there, + all this - He was informed

must full report after ATB.

Rule there more than extraction - Now, can't big climate done

Am - join FU/FB to

Kuala 1951 first test in Kuala -

Kuala's brain got fogged (can't remember in
Kuala's time to me - Amstrong's)

USC also wants to protect milk supply

USC also prevent advanced coming of tests

Katana, daughter - we will argue want to
read what you want to write?

Morgan Can't trust USC to protect you

① re Book
Pacom

re: August 1945

~~no comment~~. Really informative

+ Delegate

I like the way you bring out

the Shanzelovics "documentary" aspect

How Many Will Die

p. 12 re: firestorms: Would be useful to point out that:

- There were firestorms in Hiroshima (& Nagasaki, I think)
- Hiroshima & Nagasaki were, in part, nuclear tests are officially classified as such. So the effects of the bombings including the firestorms were probably well understood then.

There are probably declassified documents that would help here.

p. 14 Is the Kennedy back channel negotiation with Khrushchev in Oct. 1962 a partial & temporary exception?

re: para "Eisenhower had chosen to accept these risks..."

p. 15

There is a brief history of the origins & theory of air warfare on ICER's web site.

icer.org/resource/other/strategic-bombing
that you may find useful.

949-
941-7634
x2210

(2)

Iwakuni I: 1960

p 1-3

The "offensive defense" documents regarding
~~bases that I sent you~~

bases & basing strategy that
I sent you may be useful here.

Question: in PACOM Chapter you relate
that nuclear weapons were present ~~on the~~ &
part of war plans at Kaduna AFB.

How could the Japanese not know? Weren't
there any Japanese on the base?

No Japanese intelligence gathering?

It more than strains credulity that they
were not aware of the role that Japanese
bases would play in a nuclear war.

✓ p. 8 Great point re: the Maine

The Pacific Command War Plan.

p. 3. The Sino-Soviet split & the role of nuclear weapons in it is little known or understood. I hope you'll say some more about it.

Also, the split resulted in the withdrawal of Soviet technical personnel & (so far as I understand) triggered the "Great Leap Forward" - including huge efforts at small scale uranium mining for China's bomb program.

- With all the disastrous consequences for China's people of that "Great Leap" of course you know better than me the connection of those events with the 1954 & 1958 Quemoy/Matsu crisis & US nuclear threats.

Connecting these dots even briefly here would be very useful.

pp. 12-13 I think the WWI analogy
re: mobilization is fabulous.

The whole mind-set being against just
a US-Soviet war is new to me.

Briefing Bundy

~~p. 2 last line "Secretary Gates"?~~

It might be of interest to note here, or
somewhere else in the description of
nuclear war plans that no coherent view
existed of the number of warheads & bombs
the US needed.

In testimony in the 1950's (I think - I can send
you the reference) one General said the
Army needed 150,000 bombs (from memory)
for tactical use!

Of course Tamm & SAC had their famous
1956 plan to "convert the Soviet Union
into a smoking radiation ruin" with 750 bombs

Delegation II

p. 3 I did not understand this sentence:

"To the extent that ~~delegote~~ devolution and survival . . . delegation wouldn't be necessary."

→ → p. 5 Camp David is in Maryland.
Please note in the Catskill mountains.

①
p. 1

3(a) Cold War has 2 periods pre Cuban missile crisis & post ^{today} deliberate large scale nuclear war, risk may be greater than post-1962 crisis. Russia & U.S. both in decline - a new circumstance of confrontation.

{

3(b) Speculation on percentage probabilities is not useful, in my opinion.

3(c) is ~~not~~ good. Does not need 3(b).

3(d) Agree re: two doomsday mechanisms on hair-trigger.

3(d) - 2nd comment. Is it US v. Russia or as during 1962 crisis the military/nuclear establishments of both on one side, increasing risks?

{
3(e) 3(h) (i) Agree re: nuclear winter but this is a hard sell to those not involved, given that even a climate crisis that is ~~not~~ already here is not sufficiently persuasive for unified political mobilization. So how much play to give nuclear winter? -

{

- Also not new, a not something you are bringing to the table

⇒ One question should be added to your list?

~~What~~ why does the public want to pay attention to what you say? Or: what is special about you that can move public discussion/opinion?

(2)

{ 3(j) Is morality and legality ~~are~~ a central point?

| 3(k) The 1959 reference is intriguing & could be more important than the known 1968 Nixon reference

? { 3(l) I agree. This is clear & distinct from your earlier points. But if a pre-emptive strike is the aim of US posture, then wouldn't the US want the Russians to get rid of their submarine force first?

? 3(r) ~~Is I the~~ I am very skeptical that the Fissile Materials cut off treaty would be beneficial. It could have the perverse effect of encouraging civilian plutonium separation.

Generally on 3 conclusions 3(n) to 3(r)

This is a very conventional arms control / disarmament agenda apart from 3(n) - is mantle land based arm of the Triad.

~~But~~ It implies that nuclear disarmament of great priority to it & abandonment

3

of first strike posture can be achieved under the present world economic/political/military structure.

→ I think it cannot.

✓ There is every evidence that the powers that be are willing to risk extinction to maintain their power — & nuclear weapons posture is EXHIBIT A in that.

~~So your appeal evidence that~~

? S Indeed you provide evidence that the establishment knows that extinction or near extinction of humanity could be the result.

✓
- NFD So what would persuade them to now view that prospect with enough alarm that they ~~would~~ would change nuclear posture to your proposed 3(p)?

X 6(a)(b) Is it needed? Given recent NOAA participation in the paper on limited nuclear war?

6(i) Don't dilute the 100% to 90% or link to nuclear winter. Besides even 10% of US, ^{and many} ~~and~~ ^{are} ~~are~~ bigger than India or Pakistan

SCBMS

10

4

6(k) I agree n : no first use of course

but this requires a prior US posture change of a fundamental nature — much more than giving up land based missiles.

Nuclear posture change of a fundamental nature is linked to a basic change in US view of its role in the world. That is a or perhaps the critical problem.

✓ { 6(n) What is "minimum deterrence" for countries with ~100 nuclear bombs or warheads?

? { 6(p) I think a demand that NW convention negotiations begin now ~~is~~ risks getting a bad treaty at best. Not a good course at the moment in terms of priorities.

6(r) is more to the point.

✱ { 6(q) Won't dropping of nuclear umbrella for Japan lead to a Japanese nuclear arsenal? ~~I think~~
If done in the near future, I think it likely.

bottom of 13 → your argument looks down to
a hope "...if Ukraine simmers down..."

Reestablishment of US-Russian détente is
contrary to the central direction of US
politics in that arena since 1990 →
expansion of NATO, dropping the ABM Treaty,
going to war in Iraq (starting w/ 1998
bombing campaign, then again 2003) without
Security Council authorization....

What are the global conditions that
could possibly lead to its reestablishment?

~~With~~ Indeed if low oil prices persist,
the prospect is ^{dim} for such a
détente because the Russians view it as
part of US policy to squeeze them
(whether it's ^{true} or not is another question)

bottom of 13-14 ^{top of} re: India Pakistan --
"chimerical" — I agree.

(8) ~~I~~ I think your linking your
central argument ~~in~~ to nuclear winter is
a mistake. It's not the area in
which the public looks to your judgment.

p. 16

"So long as US and Russian nuclear arsenals remain at or near present levels and posture ..."

I think the "posture" part is much more important than the "levels" part

Also I think dismissing de-alerting

~~"dates"~~ "de-alerted or not"

is wrong. De-alerting with

~~De-alerting completely (minimum days or weeks to launch) would require a different posture. So~~

reconstitution ^{time} in weeks or longer would allow progress on all 3 ~~past~~ points listed below that.

p. 17

top

I think the idea that we could all die in a nuclear catastrophe is too abstract. I'll send you my 2002 interview with Barry Commoner.

p. 17 bottom

"...about half that time our leaders were unaware of it."

THIS IS
HUGE
but buried

#

(p. 18)

I would say that the climate prognosis is far more reliable and has far more evidence than nuclear winter - which has good evidence, but fortunately still indirect (volcanoes ^{fires,} and such) for the most part + some from atmosphere testing.

So the question is if the huge and mounting real world evidence on climate is not enough for concerted action at a level corresponding to the crisis - & we are in the midst of it - why would a theory of nuclear winter, no matter how cogent be persuasive enough.

This is NOT to say that it should not be part of the argument but it is to say that

1) ~~It's~~ You should reconsider its centrality to your book

2) You should look at what has worked. Three things:

1) Fall out ~~of~~ → atmospheric fallout

2) MIRVs → ABM treaty

3) 1991 Threat from loose

nukes → tactical weapons

with Israel & disarmament

6(s)

FO, first & FS

Delegitimizing nuclear weapons

Should be a central goal - but not
as a response from the bureaucracy,
~~which is the~~ but from the public

6 as a response from the bureaucracy
or the political realm is really
two pieces - ① bureaucracy
② public. They are very different

The main thing the public needs to grasp
is the reality of US nuclear policy &
what it has wrought in terms of
the danger to the US public.

{ Nuclear winter & all that has little
potential to persuade ^{in the US} no matter how
dire & correct the analysis might be

7: The most important point here is the
historical example of the unilateral
withdrawal & dismantlement of almost
all "tactical" weapons in 1991. It
was for US safety.

Similarly, getting rid of
land based missiles for US safety

7 → I think (but am not sure) that
"refurbishment" applies to SLBM warheads too.

The argument against refurbishment is
broader — not need for safety

& not needed if first strike is not a goal.

Agree re: Campaign against preemption
— but what should be its content?

It seems to me that the reality of
the specific nuclear threats (Iran, Iraq,
Guatemala, Vietnam, Korea, etc)

is lost in the strategic argumentation.

At least in this write up, the
connection is missing in your 3, 6, 7, 8.

p. 13 : So why did the "rationally
compelling" logic for NFU 25 years
ago not get implemented?

You don't address this. It's central

to understanding why the fear of
near extinction is not persuasive enough
to lead to disarmament or even NFU.

de Klenk W

AM: mention

GHWB cutting off
the weapons

1991

(and cut of Korea — brought
them to the table.)

2 Arms in decline —

a pathological

time — arriving

Porter — but for

us, too.

get rid of ICBMs

like Bush found the
new in Europe (7000)

AKH



Don't need to do
PP twice. (does)

US has had a FS
policy.

Provocation
(as in killing Iranian —
and in a few others...)

"We're the good guys"
but KU has now been
presented to US public

Not about

how many will die
by know that (?)

This is American policy
bad guys over here

American people
should knows

FU

==

8/6A
Kathy - crazy

everybody wants
back on Morrison

People think moral
arguments are opposed
to realistic ones -
if you're making
a moral argument
it's because you
don't have a
realistic argument